UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,124	10/31/2003	William M. Shapiro	07844-621001	4993

21876   7590   06/21/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/699,124	SHAPIRO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David G. Cervetti	2136	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-57</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 October 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/24/05; 2/8/07*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-57 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-30, 32-39, and 41-57 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia (US Patent 7,178,033).

Regarding claims 1 and 23, Garcia teaches receiving a request from a client

(col. 11, lines 55-67); and pre-authorizing the client, in response to the request, to allow

actions by a user as a member of a group of users by sending to the client offline

access information comprising a first key associated with the group, the first key being

useable at the client to access an electronic document by decrypting a second key in

the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31).**

Regarding claims 12 and 34, Garcia teaches receiving from a document control

server, when online, offline access information comprising a first key associated with a

group of users of the document control server **(col. 11, lines 55-67)**; and allowing

access to an electronic document, when offline, by performing operations comprising

using the first key to decrypt a second key in the electronic document and governing

actions with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information associated with the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claims 19 and 41, Garcia teaches encrypting an electronic document **(col. 11, lines 55-67)**; and incorporating into the encrypted electronic document an address of a document control server, document-permissions information, and an encryption key useable in decrypting the encrypted electronic document, the encryption key being encrypted with a key generated by, and associated with a group of users of, the document control server **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claims 45 and 56, Garcia teaches a document control server that synchronizes offline access information with a client in response to a client request, the offline access information comprising a first key associated with a group, the first key being useable at the client to access an electronic document by decrypting a second key in the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67)**; and the client that allows access to the electronic document, when offline, by a user as a member of the group, using the first key to decrypt the second key in the electronic document and governing actions with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information associated with the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 2 and 24, Garcia teaches wherein pre-authorizing the client comprises comparing a time of last recorded client-synchronization with a time of last change in user-group information for the user **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claims 3 and 25, Garcia teaches wherein pre-authorizing the client comprises comparing current user-group information for the user with received user-group information for the user from the client **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 4 and 26, Garcia teaches wherein the client allows actions with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information residing in the electronic document **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information further comprises document-permissions information associated with multiple documents, including the electronic document, and the client allows actions with respect to the electronic document based on the document-permissions information **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 6 and 28, Garcia teaches wherein receiving a request comprises receiving a request from the client to take an action with respect to a second document **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 7 and 29, Garcia teaches verifying the user at the client as an authenticated user **(col. 13, lines 40-67)**.

Regarding claims 8 and 30, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific key, including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information associated with multiple documents **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 10 and 32, Garcia teaches wherein the at least one set of document-permissions information comprises one or more policies associated with the

second document, and the offline access information further comprises a document

revocation list **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 11 and 33, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information further comprises at least one set of document-permissions information

associated with a specific document selected based on synchronization prioritization

information **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 13 and 35, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with

respect to the electronic document comprises obtaining the document-permissions

information from the electronic document **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 14 and 36, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with

respect to the electronic document comprises: identifying a document policy reference

in the electronic document; and obtaining locally retained document-permissions

information based on the document policy reference **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines

22-67)**.

Regarding claims 15 and 37, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access

information comprises at least one user-specific key, at least one group-specific key,

including the first key, at least one set of document-permissions information associated

with multiple documents, and a document revocation list **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14,

lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claims 16 and 38, Garcia teaches preventing access to the

document, when offline, if a difference between a current time and a receipt time of the

offline access information exceeds a server-synchronization-frequency parameter **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claims 17 and 39, Garcia teaches wherein the server-synchronization-frequency parameter is specific to the document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claims 20 and 42, Garcia teaches wherein the encryption key comprises a session key generated by the document control server, encrypting the electronic document comprises encrypting the electronic document using a document key, and incorporating comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic document a document security payload comprising the document key and the document-permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted using the session key **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claims 21 and 43, Garcia teaches wherein the document security payload further comprises a document identifier assigned by the document control server, and incorporating further comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic document a copy of the session key encrypted using a public key associated with the document control server **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claims 22 and 44, Garcia teaches wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the electronic document **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 46, Garcia teaches wherein the electronic document comprises the document-permissions information **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 47, Garcia teaches wherein the second key comprises a session key generated by the document control server, and the electronic document further comprises a document security payload comprising a document key and the document-permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted using the session key **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 1-65)**.

Regarding claim 48, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific key, including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information associated with multiple documents **(col. 13, lines 40-67, col. 14, lines 22-67)**.

Regarding claim 49, Garcia teaches wherein the client comprises an agent that periodically contacts the document control server to synchronize the offline access information **(col. 11, lines 40-67, col. 12, lines 32-65, fig. 3B)**.

Regarding claim 50, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises: a server core with configuration and logging components; an internal services component that provides functionality across dynamically loaded methods; and dynamically loaded external service providers, including one or more access control service providers **(col. 16, lines 31-67)**.

Regarding claim 51, Garcia teaches a business logic tier comprising a cluster of document control servers, including the document control server; an application tier including the client comprising a viewer client, a securing client, and an administration client; and a load balancer that routes client requests to the document control servers **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 52, Garcia teaches wherein the client request comprises a request from the client to take an action with respect to a second document **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31).**

Regarding claim 53, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises a permissions-broker server including a translation component, the second document comprises a document secured previously by the permissions-broker server, and the translation component being operable to translate first document-permissions information in a first permissions-definition format into second document-permissions information in a second permissions-definition format in response to the request being received from the client **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31).**

Regarding claim 54, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a permissions-broker server operable to identify information associated with the second document in response to the request, the associated information being retained at the server and indicating a third electronic document different from and associated with the second document, the server being operable to relate information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31).**

Regarding claim 55, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a permissions-broker server operable to obtain and send, in response to the request, a software program comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatus to perform operations effecting an authentication procedure, and the client uses the authentication program to identify a current user and control the

action with respect to the second document based on the current user and document-permissions information associated with the second document **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Regarding claim 57, Garcia teaches server means for dynamically obtaining and sending authentication processes in response to client requests to take actions with respect to electronic documents; and client means for interfacing with a received authentication process to identify a current user and for controlling actions with respect to electronic documents based on the current user and document-permissions information **(col. 15, lines 29-67, col. 16, lines 1-31)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   **Claims 9, 18, 31, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia, and further in view of DeMarines (NPL "Authentica: Content Security for the Enterprise").**

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Garcia does not expressly disclose receiving an offline audit log from the client. However, DeMarines teaches receiving an offline audit log from the client **(page 10)**. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide offline audit logs.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a

modification to keep track of offline access to secured files **(DeMarines, pp. 2-3)**.

Regarding claims 18 and 40, Garcia does not expressly disclose maintaining an

offline audit log; and uploading the offline audit log when online. However, DeMarines

teaches maintaining an offline audit log; and uploading the offline audit log when online

(page 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to provide offline audit logs. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to keep track of

offline access to secured files **(DeMarines, pp. 2-3)**.

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

7.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DGC

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

6/19/07